

Office of the Director
111 N. Front St., 8th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-7795
(614) 645-6675 (FAX)

Planning Division
111 N. Front St., 3rd Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-8664

Downtown Commission
Daniel J. Thomas (Staff)
Urban Design Manager
(614) 645-8404
djthomas@columbus.gov

DOWNTOWN COMMISSION RESULTS

Tuesday, September 25, 2018 - 8:30 AM

2:45

**111 N. Front Street, Michael B. Coleman Government Center
Hearing Room (Second Floor)**

I. Attendance

Present: Steve Wittmann (Chair); Otto Beatty, Jr.; Tedd Hardesty; Kyle Katz;
Mike Lusk; Robert Loversidge; Jana Maniace; Danni Palmore

Absent: None

City Staff: Daniel Thomas

II. Approval of the August 28, 2018 Downtown Commission Meeting Results

Motion to Approve RL, DP (8-0)

III. Request Certificate of Appropriateness

Case #1 18-9-1

3:38

Address: 562 E. Main Street

Applicant and Architect: Mode Architects / Mark Ours

Property Owner: Nationwide Children's Hospital / Gary Claar

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for renovation. Conversion of building for print shop for hospital. CC3359.05(C)1)

Discussion: DT – formerly offices for Homeport. Two aisles of parking in the rear will be consolidated to one aisle and maneuvering for truck loading, which will free up room for a landscape edge. MO – only effecting what is on their property. There are poles in the middle of the sidewalk. Still has to go to Public Services. SW – approve the way it is and if need be, come back. KK – move for acceptance. MK – 2nd. -----

Results: Approved (8-0)

Case #2 18-9-2

6:50

Address: 80 E. Rich Street (80 on the Commons)

Applicant: Morrison Sign Co. / Jarrod Norton / Larry Lab

Owner: Two25 Commons LLC

Architect: NBBJ

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for signage. CC3359.05(C)1)

Discussion: DT - Was originally the S. Third St. address, 225 on the Commons, but has now been reoriented to Rich St. SW – asked applicant to locate the graphics. Sign on Rich St. will be a backlit panel. KK – move for acceptance, RL – 2nd.

Results: Approved (8-0)

Case #3 18-9-3

10:13 / 1:36:40

Address: 491 Park Street

Park Street Cantina

Applicant and Architect: Craig C. Smith, Jr. – New Avenue Architects & Engineers

Owner: 491 North Park Real Estate LLC

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for a new infill permanent structure that will replace a temporary (seasonal) tent. CC3359.05(C)1)

Discussion: DT – tent has been up for a long time, many venues are extending their seasonal use of tents. (Postponed to later in meeting for materials to show up). CS – plan to replace the temporary tent structure with a permanent structure. This will enclose bar and gathering place. Intent is to allow use all year round. The structure would be opened up in the summer. In the summer it would have a similar look and feel as it does now, but will be enclosed in colder months. Existing pictures showed followed by renderings. Initial concept is to work with the existing shape and form. The new building will be steel frame with translucent paneling. We wanted to stay with what we had with size, shape and feel of the building.

SW – what is on the right on site? – CS – a wooden raised seating platform. SW – how did that get built? Was there a permit? RL – did any of this get a permit? CS – it's been there as long as we've known. DT – tent itself was administratively approved, as are numerous seasonal entertainment tents. Sometimes these tents remain standing longer than seasonal. Is the building heated? CS – not the current tent, but the new building would be. RL – would this be classified as a building or is it a tent? Does it have restrooms? CS – we are not looking to increase the occupancy. Restrooms are inside the actual current building.

SW – you are going to leave the existing fence? CS – yes. We are open for suggestions. SW – This used to be a very cute place when it was first Tapatio. Now it looks junky. Get the whole thing kind of cleaned up. I understand that this is supposed to be Mexican. If it got a fresh paint color, or a cap along the top of the parapet, if something got tweaked on the windows. I don't know if the railing wants or needs to stay. I sure would like to see something happen to the raised seating area on the north. I'm having a hard time seeing what this whole thing would look like.

CS – at this point we were working our way up in terms of scope. Trying to get a feel for what might be appropriate. We are willing to entertain ideas. SW – if this is a structure, does that mean you will be putting in foundations, new floors? CS – yes. JM – this is an opportunity to the spacing of columns and other features to improve the space. It can be its own distinct structure and not be part of the other building. How do you make it so it flows and make sense with the surrounding buildings? What happens to the “alley” space? Is there a canopy? You can be more creative. You don't have to just keep the form of the tent. Maybe complement the Cantina building more.

SW – what is the siding material? CS – using a Cowall product, a panel system. There are different options, colors and opacity. Sample shown. We are continuing to explore options. Translucency would allow people to get a feel for activity. SW – translucent, not transparent at street level going all the way down to the ground? CS – at one time we were looking at a corrugated metal. SW – there is no rake board or fascia at the roof? CS – we were keeping it basic and simple. RL – how will these be removable? CS – these pieces would be no larger than 4 x 8 and would be taken out for extended periods of time to off-site storage. RL – why not

polycarbonate that you could see a little more through? CS – there are different levels of opacity, all the way to clear. Possibly different colors and view areas. TH – I would like to see more transparency. I hate for you to lose the energy that is there in the summer when it is closed off. SW – why not glass doors? CS – problem with stacking space (tight constraints). TH – have you considered removing that older raised platform to make building a little bigger? It would be a way to clean up this area and still have plenty of occupancy. CS – trying to get a feel for the parameters being next to an historic district. JM – maybe glass garage doors that stay on site. CS – the owner didn't like this idea. It does take up a lot of space overhead. And it makes it difficult to design some of the lighting. SW – I think it should be transparent. I don't think this design is well developed. I think there should be trim. RL – it could be a hip roof. CS – possibly something more rectangular in shape. SW – I don't have a problem with the gable end. JM – you do want it to look more open. It is still a courtyard. SW – you need to look at the whole façade of this piece of property. RL – with the Arena District we once tried to find words to codify chaos in terms of having fun. Fun is necessary with this structure. It looks like a tent, do something cool with it. Confusion as to whether this was final or conceptual review. CS -mostly, we wanted to get in front of the Commission to get a feel for the direction. MK – I don't think the tent is the way to go. TH – look at the whole space. SW – I'm not against something tenty, this is somewhat of a prominent location.

Results: Tabled

Case #4 18-9-4

Address: 147 Vine Street (Dahlia)

11:23 / 1:57:37

Applicant and Architect: 3D / Group, Inc. / Tony Colosimo

Owner: CCA Development LLC

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of awning over patio. Replaces existing canvas awning. CC3359.05(C)1)

Discussion: (Postponed to later in meeting for applicant). DT – site of former “The Garage”. Its been Dahlia for a number of years. The awning will be white fabric to match the building. The trees are away from where the awning will be. TH – move for approval, ML – 2nd.

Results: Approved (8-0)

Case #5 18-9-5

12:20 / 2:00:00

Address: 274 E. Long Street

Applicant and Design Professional: Juliet Bullock

Attorney Connie Klema

Property Owner: Urban Restorations

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for infill residential. Three stories with parking incorporated on the ground floor. CC3359.05(C)1)

Recent History of Site

This project was conceptually reviewed in July. See accompanying Results.

Discussion: (Postponed to later in meeting for applicant). This case was heard in July. The Commission was generally positive then but made some suggestions. JB – summation of changes – articulation of windows on the first level of the E. Long St. façade. New building sections

provided. Additional windows on the lower level. Metal, as opposed to stucco will be used above the first floor, which will be brick. Questions about materials and windows. The metal siding will be a light gray or white. Color samples shown. The window frames will be black. The garage are intended to blend in with the brick color. The roof will be a darker gray color. There will be some variation in shades of light gray. Black entry doors on the south. Roof canopy to match major roof (darker gray - charcoal). ML – concern with documentation of colors. ML – move for approval on the condition of documentation of colors of materials. SW to reinforce - charcoal grey for the roof, light gray (889) or white (899) for the metal, white painted brick for the base, black windows, white garage doors to match brick. TH – 2nd. RL – reiterated ML concern over lack of details.

Results: Approved conditioned upon submitting color details of materials to staff. (6-0)

IV. Request for Certificate of Appropriateness for a Portion of Project / Conceptual Review for Demolition of Another Portion

Case #6 18-9-6

13:12

Address: 72-74 N. High St. / 78 N. High St.

Applicant: Richard T. Day (RD)

Design Professional: Meyers + Associates Architecture – Nick Munoz (CM & NM)

Property Owner: Haines Madison LLC

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for Revisions to Façade of Previously Approved Project, specifically, the façade of 72-74 N. High St.

Conceptual Review of other modifications, particularly the demolition of 78 N. High St.

*The Commission originally approved the renovation of 72-90 N. High Street in April of 2016. Last month the Commission reviewed a submission with an alteration of the façade of 72-74 with a more contemporary appearance. The Commission basically liked the new proposal, but felt that more information and detail was necessary. This is currently being presented. **Additionally, the applicant is asking that the demolition of the adjacent 4 story 78 N. High St. be considered. Request for final review for demolition by applicant.***

Additional information distributed.

It was decided to break this application (RL) into two parts – the first dealing with details of 72-74 N. High that was heard in August and the second involving demolition of 78 N. High.

Part 1 – Approval of details for 72-74 N. High St.

Discussion: NM – showing of materials. New brick at lower level of façade. Close but distinct. KK – perhaps should be more different. Will try to match mortar color. There is also a steel band that will help separate the two bricks. There will also be texture difference. The steel store front is the major emphasis of the lower three floors. RL – I think the brick choice is fine. CM – description of storefront materials. KK – anything done to articulate the entrance doors or give them more prominence, i.e. small canopy. CM – the entry doors are inset, there will also be a glow from some concealed lighting. Construction details shown. Intent is to replicate the cornice utilizing old photographs. Colors are intended to be black as opposed to stone color. ML – clarification of window details from one drawing to another. CM – perspective is more accurate better (RL – agrees). RL – move approval, send in details of the cornice to staff. CM – will also coordinate renderings and elevations, particularly in terms of window mullions. KK – 2nd.

Results: Approved with condition of details of cornice (7-1-0), Hardesty recusing

Part 2 – Conceptual Review (Final) of demolition of 78 N. High St.

29:07

Discussion: RD – Madison goes back about 2/3rds the depth of the block – it’s landlocked on three sides, with not much potential for natural light as well as ingress and egress. There is a conditional lease for offices for a little over half of the Madison Building. We would like to remove this 20 foot wide building. We are proposing the creation of an outdoor entrance area at both the High St. and Pearl St. ends of the space. Exiting Pearl provides access to parking. NM – a new steel structure will be built to help maintain the continuity of the street. The fence would be set back 14 ft. to create an urban pocket. The tenants entry point would be about the middle of the block. The Madison’s building’s storefront would be maintained for retail. The proposed tenant would occupy the 3-5 floors. KK – there is a risk of not having a direct entrance off of High St. RL – there are no drawings showing the new northern façade of the Madison Bldg. RD – there are openings where windows used to go. CM – the openings on this façade are dependent upon tenant improvements. RL - you are asking us to tear down an historic building when you don’t know what you are going to do with the new elevation. 78 N. High is an intact historic façade. I can imagine that something creatively done this could be an interesting urban alley. But all you are saying now is that you want to tear this building down and put up a little screen fence. I have a problem with that. SW - If the Madison Building is an adaptive reuse you could carve out big windows and do something interesting. I’m not real excited about what you are proposing to do with the fence proposal. I think this could be interesting with buildings on two sides. DP – the Madison was iconic, with arches and depth. What I see here is a good start but its rather boring. I see this as an opportunity of standing out on High Street. Make it inviting to make me want to turn in there to see what is going on.

KK – if we are talking about what should be placed there, it supposes that the building will come down. DP, ML – that’s the first question. RL – we won’t approve a demolition unless we know that what is going back will be an improvement. KK – and it’s financed – we know it will happen. I think we are open to 78 being demolished. OB – what would be the safety ramifications of this space in terms of lighting and access?

RD – the reality is we can’t lease Madison if 78 stays. We want to get the Madison renovated, leased and activating the street and jump starting improvements to the rest of the block. Short of being able to do that, we are stopped in our tracks. RL – give us a fair proposal of how the alley will be developed.

Becky West – Columbus Landmarks – possibility of saving the historic façade, to retain that fabric. Only 25% of our pre 1945 buildings remain. This is a gem and represents an intact half block. KK – if demolition is allowed, I would like something to remain that would speak to the past. ML – what if you were to keep the first 20 ft. or so of the building to allow for elevator and egress and open up the back of the existing building for lighting? I’d be for demolition if it makes the other two buildings salvageable. CM – maybe work with elements of the 78 façade but not the full height. Maintain the continuity at street level and bring the pedestrian back to this creative narrow urban alley. What is the north elevation and window openings. KK – be prepared to talk about security and gates as well as lighting and landscaping. SW – on a conceptual level, if this thing got put together right, we could pass the demolition. It needs more work. You should be able to walk out of here with a good level of confidence. We say to you “we get it”, you come back with some polished program of what you want to do. RD – we are under deadlines with the prospective tenant. SW – I think with the tenant you can say the building can be taken down. KK – we don’t want to bust their pro forma. CM – design challenges to accommodate various forces. There is an urgency. RD - there is a certain level of uncertainty as to what goes on in the space due to what will go on with the building to the north. SW – come back, I would be trying to plan

that in. Having an idea of that would make it all much better. We do approve things and are open if there are changes in the future. It would be worth doing a study on the White Haines to see how it would interact in terms of windows. Glass and interesting lighting. It could be a great space. CM – we’ll have concrete direction on the north façade of the Madison and probably some speculation of the White Haines as to what could happen. This whole project involves separate entities. We’ll be back before you when that happens. The north facade, the treatment of the alley, and an idea of what the White Haines might become. SW – pavers, landscaping, lighting – you’d want to do all this anyway. CM – it could be an interim or even final solution. SW – the entrance to the alley needs to have some mass – maybe leaving the façade or a portion of the façade. Look at where the existing cornice is. Maybe key off of the black aluminum members from the adjacent Madison. Have it do something for the streetscape. CM – variations of remnants of 78. SW – reuse some bricks for a column. Make certain it has a presence.

Results: Tabled

V. Conceptual Reviews

Case #7 18-9-7C

57:48

Location: Northeast corner of Long and Sixth Streets (address unassigned)

Applicant and Architect: Lupton Rausch Architects / David Goth

Property Owner: Gay Street Condominium LLC

Request:

Conceptual Review for parking garage. Includes ground floor retail.

Discussion: DT – Parking structure include retail fronting E. Long as well as dog park. Illustrations have been provided. A lot of recent development in the E. Long St. area. DG – pushing the parking back towards the alleys allows some space along Long and Sixth for other programmatic things such as the retail and the dog park as well as stairs and other architectural features. The site is currently surface parking. There is a dog parking occupying the same general area where the new dog park will go.

KK – I think this is one of the best garages I’ve seen. It’s integrated well into the corner. I like the forms but opening up the retail to a little more transparency would be good. RL – I agree. DG – the stairs are probably going to have an open mesh. We’ll be back with specifics on materials and details for final approval. It will be an open air garage. JM – the retail seems to be a double height space – you might want to take advantage of this. This will be a private garage serving the residents of the adjacent developments.

TH – streetscape standards should be given consideration. What is needed to get some effective trees. Maybe slightly lessen the dimensions of the dog park to have more room for plantings. TM – none of the new development in the area (currently) has granite curbs. TH – the relatively new standard is to have granite. If you want to deviate from those standards, the Commission would weigh in. The fact that you’ve already invested in the area and have established precedence might be a legitimate reason. DT – 230 E. Long, a large development, will most likely have to follow standards.

Results: Conceptual review only, no vote taken

Case #8 18-9-8C

1:07:44

Address: 400 N. High Street (Convention Center – Entrance off of E. Nationwide Blvd.)

Applicant: Schooley Caldwell Associates / Steven Munger – Project Manager

Property Owner: Franklin Co. Convention Facilities Authority / Scott Reed – Project Manager
Architect: Schooley Caldwell Associates / Robert Smith – Principal

Request:

Conceptual Review for parking garage.

Discussion: Information to be presented is expanded from what was in packet. SM – Ohio Center Garage – immediately to the east of the Ohio Center (which has Battelle Hall and the Hyatt). A lot of traffic, primarily vehicular, brought in to the city by this facility, many of whom are non-Columbus area. A number of Convention Facility garages and lots (sited). Site for the new garage is currently the servicing and marshalling yard for the Convention Center – cooling tower, staff parking and access to some mechanical. Access only from Ohio Center Way East via south bound Third St. viaduct. Description of site boundaries.

650 new parking spaces are needed primarily as a precursor to the expansion of the Hilton Hotel. Garage will have a combination of monthly, daily and valet parking. Trying to get a very intuitive and polished path from the garage to the convention center.

Program: Eliminate large cooling tower and install a new more efficient one further away. Echo colors, materials and rhythms that are on the existing facility. Entry at 2nd level because of viaduct approach. Same height as the convention center. Scrolling marquee will be eliminated. Expand the capacity of the south garage (accessed from E. Nationwide Blvd.), particularly if there is overflow with access to the new garage at a lower level from Nationwide. Primary access to the new garage is only from east bound off ramp of I-670 onto the south bound Third St. viaduct or the viaduct itself. SW – driving to this garage is less than intuitive. SR – there will be instructions on how to get to various garages from the airport. SM – there are still challenges in navigating this site. Two story connection off of pedestrian walkway. There is not a pedestrian presence along Third, almost exclusively vehicular.

Materials discussed, among which are copper and orange colors identifying the convention center. Desire to give the Third St. façade more of a front door appearance. Artist has developed undulating silver screen (kinetic) façade that will also be lit. Brief video of other installations shown. Screen picks up on Eisenman's flowing architecture. Lighting discussed.

SW – moves us away from the back end approach. Suggest that screen not necessarily line up with floors. JM – less abrupt end of screen. ML – any thought of doing something more ceremonial off of Third St., i.e. banners? SM – yes – lighting, Jersey barriers, railing height, possible greenery on building. Event banners as well.

Results: Conceptual review only, no vote taken (Loversidge and Hardesty recusing)

VI. Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition / Conceptual Review

Case #9 18-9-9D&C

Address: Rear of 602 E. Town St.

Applicant and Architect: Karrick Sherrill – Shremshock Architects

Property Owner: Joe Collins Property LLC (Rabbi Areyeh Kaltmann)

Attorney: Jack Reynolds

Structural Engineers: Jezerinac Geers

Request:

Demolition of carriage house.
Presentation of preliminary concept.

This property is located in the East Town Street Historic District which comes under the jurisdiction of the Historic Resources Commission (HRC). The HRC is schedule to review and act on the demolition request on Thursday, September 20, 2018.

CASE WAS PULLED FROM THE AGENDA. The HRC tabled demolition request at their Thursday, September 20, 2018 meeting.

VII. Business / Discussion / Report

Business Meeting desired

Public Forum

Staff Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued since last notification (August 18, 2018)

Ad Mural – *Bold & Italics*

1. 405 E. Mound – Turner Barber Shop – blade sign
2. 152 E. Broad – Credit Union of Ohio – window graphics
3. ***34 N High (N) – Drive Capital ad mural***
4. 500 E Mound – Site compliance for parking – First Education Credit Union
5. 300 Marconi – new corner sign – Schooley-Caldwell
6. 300 E. Broad – Signs for the new Vets
7. ***66 S Third – ABC Fall Series ad mural***
8. 20 E. Broad – roof access and deck
9. 92 N. Fifth – roof replacement
10. ***35 W. Spring – Apple Marriott ad mural***
11. ***55 E. Spring – COTA ad mural***
12. ***274 S Third – The Rookie ad mural***
13. ***8 E Long – Atlas Building – change out one panel of 3 – Nationwide Children’s AM***
14. 300 Marconi – corner sign – Business First
15. ***66 S. Third – Coors ad mural***
16. ***88 E. Broad (Third St. façade) – wall sign – OH Pizza and Brew***
17. ***60 E Long – Apple iPhoneXs ad mural***
18. ***263 N Front – Apple iPhoneXs ad mural***
19. ***43 W Long - Apple iPhoneXs ad mural***
20. ***15 W Cherry - Apple iPhoneXs ad mural***

Next regular meeting will be on October 23, 2018, the fourth Tuesday of the month (four weeks away).

If you have questions concerning this agenda, please contact Daniel Thomas, Urban Design Manager, Planning Division at 614-645-8404.

2::14:07